UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

An Attempt at a Definition of Religion - - - - - - - - *Gabriel Rombotis*

Steamboat Pulpit - - - - - *Don West*

Background of the Situation in India - - - - - - - - - *Curtis W. Reese*

What Is Left of Marxism? - *Victor S. Yarros*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXXVIII NUMBER 8

Chicago, October, 1942

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Gabriel Rombotis: After graduating from Meadville Theological School, Doctor Rombotis took his Ph.D. degree in the Department of Comparative Religion, University of Chicago.

Don West: Preacher and poet; formerly, minister of the Christian Fellowship Parish of Bethel, Ohio; later, minister of the Meansville Parish, Meansville, Georgia, and editor of the *Country Parson.*

Victor S. Yarros: Frequent contributor to UNITY.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.....115
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.....118

ARTICLES—

An Attempt at a Definition of Religion—GABRIEL ROMBOTIS....118
Steamboat Pulpit—DON WEST.....120
Background of the Situation in India—
CURTIS W. REESE 122
What Is Left of Marxism?—VICTOR S. YARROS.....126

POETRY—

Survival—MADELINE MULVEY 121

THE STUDY TABLE—

An Appeal for World Unity—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.....128

THE FIELD—

Adult Education—*Bulletin,* Chicago Council on Adult Education.114

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Adult Education

The requirements of the war have placed an unprecedented responsibility on individuals and institutions in the United States. Each person is expected to perform his tasks, whether they be military or civilian, with zeal and efficiency, and to devote more of his thought and energy to the concerns of the community and the nation. In the effort of the individual to perfect his skills, to develop his understanding and mastery of the forces bearing upon his welfare, and to keep mentally and physically fit so that he may intelligently and effectively perform his duties as a citizen in this wartime democracy, adult education offers opportunities through which he may grow in stature and more effectively serve the common welfare.

The Adult Education Council through conferences, lectures, and personal consultation seeks to interpret adult education to the public, to bring about planning of educational activities among the leaders in adult education which bear upon the urgent problems of individual and group life, and to assist individuals in finding opportunities for continuing education which equip them better for their role as free citizens.

The focus of attention of the Adult Education Council in developing its program for the war period and in considerations of post-war problems falls in the following areas:

1. The problem of personal responsibility in the present crisis and in the post-war period.
2. The problems of economic adjustment during and following the war, and vocational readjustment during and following the war.
3. The problem of restating the democratic idea and ideal in their immediate and long range applications.
4. The problem of considering now the political, economic, and social needs of the international community in preparation for the post-war world.
5. The problem of keeping alive cultural values during the war through education, recreation, and the arts.
6. The complex of problems affecting family stability.
7. The problems of mental and physical health for the individual and the community.
8. The problems of minority groups in achieving a fuller share in the responsibilities and opportunities of democratic citizenship.
9. The problems of government and centralization of power as they affect life and values in a democratic society.
10. The problem of individual and group participation in effectively participating in formulating and executing plans for the successful conduct of the war and the readjustments which will follow the war.—*Bulletin, Chicago Council on Adult Education.*

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVIII OCTOBER, 1942 No. 8

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

It is heartening to read a recent editorial in the *Presbyterian Tribune,* all the more heartening in contrast with the belligerency which is overcoming the religious journals of this country in defiance of the steadfast Christian attitude of the churches. The *Tribune* editorial asks the old question, "Has Christianity failed?" —and it answers:

> It certainly has not succeeded. The sound of marching troops and rolling tanks drowns out its appeals for fraternity and forgiveness. The hero today is the one who has slain his fellow men. . . . A standard of values more antithetical to Christian principles cannot be imagined. To see this and confess defeat is part of Christian honesty and realism. But the words "failure" and "defeat" do not quite fit the situation. Say rather that our cause is "blocked." It finds itself facing a spirit alien to its genius, with which it will never make peace. Christianity and war cannot be reconciled, and evidence mounts to the effect that multitudes of people realize this fact. A stone wall seems to stand in the path of the Christian faith, but we will hammer at that wall until it yields. . . . The Christian cause is blocked by a spirit of hate so overwhelming that everything seems to be broken by it. But the Christian cause has not failed. Not yet. Nor ever. It will accept no blockade as final.

To this I say, Amen. Christianity has neither failed nor been defeated. Rather has it been denied, defied, repudiated, rejected—"blocked," as the Presbyterian editor puts it. Christianity is meeting the same treatment today that it met in Jesus' day when the words of the Gospel first fell from his inspired lips. His faith is being crucified, even as he himself was crucified, by a world that knows no power but that of force. But that faith is no more a failure than Jesus was a failure when he hung from the cross. That faith is no more defeated than Jesus was defeated when the Roman soldiers laughed at his broken body and divided his clothes among them. Failure and defeat in that far distant day lay with Caesar and his proud arms, as also with the priests who had their part in the dreadful tragedy. But Jesus was "lifted up" in triumph, and from that day to this has drawn "all men unto [Him]." Strange that, when the drama of Calvary is re-enacted, as it has been re-enacted so many times, the world should not recognize it! Stranger still that, when the drama thus returns, as it has returned today, so many Christians should not see that their business is to be crucified after the example of their Lord! We look upon the same kind of a world that Jesus and his disciples looked upon. Why should we, his later day disciples, escape, or seek to escape, the fate that befell them at the hands of this same world? That way, and that way alone, lies the path of victory so long as this world exists. The editorial of the *Presbyterian Tribune* reminds me of the great story of Peter fleeing along the Appian Way from Rome in the days of Nero's terror. According to the story, he met Jesus, and cried out, in amazement, "Whither goest thou, Master?" And Jesus replied, "*To Rome, to be crucified again!*"

II

There has been published in England, and released by the British censor for publication in this country, the statement issued by the 274th Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends in Great Britain. This statement is remarkable if only for the searching of inner mind and heart which preceded its preparation. According to the *Friends Intelligencer,* there was a strong feeling in this meeting that there should be issued to the world "a reaffirmation of Friends Peace Testimony, together with a call to peace now." On the other hand there was a feeling that a mere statement of this kind was not enough, and that "they must be sure that they had the 'given' word on the matter and the faith to follow it in their own lives." Here was conscience at work on the greatest question of the hour! For three days the Meeting wrestled with this problem, and only at the last business session was a statement agreed upon it. It was as follows:

> The whole world is drawn into common suffering. Is there no way out of its evils but by waging war yet more ruthlessly? War is evil and wrong; military victory will not bring true peace. Cannot our common suffering make us aware of our common brotherhood?
>
> Let us turn from the terrible deeds we do to one another and seek one another's forgiveness. The way of friendship can overcome evil. We see it perfectly in Jesus Christ. Its cost was the Cross. The loyal spirit which faced the Cross showed us the triumphant power of God. For us, as children of a common Father, it is time to follow his lead.

This statement has remarkable qualities. Thus, it maintains the unbroken unity of mankind—that we are

all "children of a common Father," and at this hour are one in "common suffering." Secondly, it states with perfect precision that "war is evil and wrong" and that "military victory will not bring true peace." Thirdly, it lays down no dogmatic program of action, but insistently raises the question as to whether there is "no way out" of the present predicament "but by waging war yet more ruthlessly." And lastly it makes appeal to the highest spiritual ideals of our civilization, and therewith brings to a supposedly Christian nation the supreme challenge of Jesus and the Cross. This, it seems to me, is religion properly at work in the awful crisis of this hour. This is what the churches should be saying and doing in wartime. If the churches cannot rise to the level of this utterance of the English Friends, or would say and do anything less, then in the name of simple decency they should close their doors "for the duration."

III

When Mr. Churchill has had to eat so many of the hard words he used to speak about Stalin and the Communists, it seems strange that he should keep on saying so many hard words about Gandhi and the All-India Congress. For if anything can be sure in this uncertain world, it is that Mr. Churchill will have to eat these words too. Only recently we have had the edifying picture of Mr. Churchill sitting down with the Russian dictator and working out common problems in the common interest of the war against the Axis powers. How long will it be before we shall look upon a similarly edifying picture of Mr. Churchill sitting down with the Indian Mahatma and working out common problems in the common interest of India, Britain, and the United States? That day will have to come soon, if, as Miss Pearl Buck has told us, the war is not to be lost in Asia. Meanwhile, in the existing situation, the advantage lies all with Gandhi. For it is the British Premier who is now intransigent. Gandhi is still willing to negotiate. Before his arrest, he was suspending his non-violent resistance movement for a period of time which he was proposing to use for conference with the Viceroy. Since his imprisonment, Gandhi has written the Viceroy, asking that they work together to find the way of granting independence to India without damage to the Allied cause. It is Mr. Churchill now who will not budge. "Churchill Bars India Compromise," headlines the New York *Times* in publishing its account of the Prime Minister's speech to the Commons on India. In this speech Mr. Churchill laid down the terms of the Cripps offer as final as a papal bull or an imperial ukase. "The broad principles of the declaration made by the British Government," said Mr. Churchill, "stand in their full scope and integrity. No one can add to them and no one can take anything away." But, this, of course, is ridiculous—and, as the very essence of intransigence, this is tragic. Nothing is ever final in this sense, not even the text of the Bible any more. Which means that, sooner or later, Mr. Churchill will have to change as drastically in his attitude toward India as he has in his attitude toward Russia! The hope in the present crisis lies with the great common sense of the English people and their more enlightened representatives. Mr. Churchill's speech, reports the New York *Times*, pleased Conservative members of the House, but was met with "angry interruptions" on the floor. Some members "thought the statement ill-advised and calculated to create additional difficulties in India." Others, condemning the speech as "provocative," prepared "to challenge the government in a debate on the whole question." Gandhi may patiently bide his time. The determination of the Indians, the conscience of the English people, and the crisis of the war will do their perfect work!

IV

Norway has a dual distinction in this war. On the one hand, it has produced the vilest of traitors—the man Quisling, who has added a new word of disgrace and shame to our language. On the other hand, it possesses a population which seems to me to be the bravest of all the enslaved populations of Europe. Already the Norwegians have written a veritable saga of heroism. This saga begins with the leaders of the country—the ministers of the churches, for example, who have refused to do the will of their conquerors. Headed by their bishops, now held in confinement, these ministers have resigned their churches, thereby forfeiting their state stipends, and are serving their congregations in meetings held in open fields or private houses, after the example of the early Christians. Side by side with these clergymen stand the public school teachers who are in revolt against the Quisling regime. More than 12,000 of the nation's 14,000 teachers have declared that they would "not conduct education along Nazi lines." Great numbers of these teachers have been arrested, beaten, confined in concentration camps, deported to remote regions in the arctic north. Still they refuse to give in. Recently a group of teachers still at large signed a declaration which reads in part:

> I reaffirm my protest against the Teachers Front. The teacher must teach children to believe in and desire that which is true and just. . . . I will never ask my pupils to do anything which in my opinion is not in accord with the truth.

Behind these gallant teachers, who thus defy Hitler and all his works, stand the parents of the children involved. Recently the schools opened for the fall season. German teachers were at their desks, and the rooms were empty of pupils. The parents had refused to send their boys and girls to school! On the one hand, they were resolved to hold up the hands of the martyr-teachers. On the other hand, they did not propose to have their children indoctrinated with the ideas which have debauched a whole generation of

youth in Germany. As I ponder this sublime spectacle of resistance to tyranny, I find myself thinking of the might of non-violence when backed by discipline and courage. Here is an opposition to the enemy more terrible and therefore more effective than all the killing of German officers, wrecking of trains, bombing of buildings, and other sabotage of which so much is reported out of the occupied regions of Europe. Any opposition to oppression, be it said, is heroic. Gandhi has declared that, as between violence and cowardice, he prefers violence! But non-violent opposition to oppression is likewise heroic, and far more potent in the long run.

V

There is reason for encouragement, but no reason for complacency today in the matter of civil liberties in wartime. The dikes of democracy in this country still stand high and strong, but the raging waters of war are beating against them all the time, and they lie thus in danger all the time of being swept away. Already, at certain points, one can note the seeping process begun. It is a sobering experience, for example, to read page 154 of the September issue of *Fellowship*. Here we read that certain individual Japanese-Americans and their families will be allowed "to leave the relocation centers where they now are and to start their lives over again in communities outside of the eight western states from which they were originally removed." This is heartening news! But it means that there are concentration camps in this country in which men and women are confined by arbitrary order of government. On this same page is an account of men indicted under the Conscription Act, and now awaiting trial—nine young men aged eighteen or nineteen, and one older man aged forty-six. On the next page of the paper is published a list of three Fellowship of Reconciliation members recently placed in prison, with the name of a fourth member now awaiting trial. This is a list supplementary to others earlier published. We pass no judgment on these cases of indictment and incarceration. The government is acting as it has to act under the law—in most cases, is practising moderation, and in only a few cases has shown undue severity. It is not possible yet to speak of persecution, which has the sadistic element of oppression for its own sake. But the significant thing is that a process has here begun. It is a process which has found immortal expression in Virgil's famous phrase about "easy is the descent into Avernus." Once get well started on the road, and the rest is a slip and a swift slide into the pit! As the war goes on and the losses pile up, men will become bitter, then hateful, and at last hysterically cruel. As the government puts one man after another behind the bars, it will begin to get callous, and finally vindictive instead of just. As the laws become more stringent and severe, freedom will tend to fade little by little into the black night of tyranny. We are a long way off from this black night today. It will never engulf this country as it has engulfed Germany. Here the light will never be quite extinguished! But a process is none the less under way, and this process is dangerous, as in wartime all things are dangerous. Hence good reason not for complacency but for vigilance, that what we have be not lost!

VI

Let us be perfectly clear about the Congressional elections now being fought out in this country. Let us state the issues now, so that there may be no sleight-of-hand shifting of these issues after the campaign is over and the ballots counted. When the primary campaigns were under way, a dead set was made against the non-interventionists. These men must be defeated, was the cry! In New York, on the morning of the primaries, the *Times* declared that "in the six counties for Representative the major issue in each case is the incumbent's voting record on foreign policy." In its pre-election story, the Associated Press said, of the nation at large, that "the primary balloting produces a test of Presidential influence and pre-war foreign policies." When the fight against the non-interventionists proved to be an all but total failure, the scene suddenly changed, and the press agreed that local issues were the determining factors. All this confuses the public mind, to say nothing of its downright dishonesty. Even a race-track "tout" will admit when he is defeated! So let it be clearly understood thus early what is up for decision in this present campaign. Is it the war, whether it is good or bad, whether we should have gone into it, whether it shall be fought through to victory? Not at all! These questions are largely settled. There is every sign that, whether the people like it or not, they are going to carry on to the bitter end. As I survey the country, I find not a single anti-war candidate. The war is simply not under discussion. But the conduct of the war *is!* The efficiency of the administration, the practical policies of the President as an executive, the whole business of getting on with this war—here are the issues. The government is up for judgment—whether it is doing a good job. On the day after this election, the President will know whether he is holding the confidence of the country or not. The situation is the same in America as in England. Across the seas, in bye-election after bye-election, independent candidates have appeared in the constituencies. In certain notable instances, these independent candidates have won. Has this meant that the English voters are tired of the war—that they want to make terms with Hitler? No interpretation of results could be wider of the mark. The issue in each case has been not the war but the way the war is being carried on. Mr. Churchill has been called sharply to account, and told

to mend his ways. Will this happen to Mr. Roosevelt next month? Nobody knows, not even Mr. Gallup! But let us face the issue and stand by it! If Democrats very generally win, then will the President know that the people on the whole approve of the way he is running this war. If, on the other hand, there are widespread Republican and independent victories, then will the President know that he and his advisors have lost the public confidence. The result will be a healthy thing for us all to know.

Jottings

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, in the August issue of *Fellowship,* publishes his definition of war. He calls it "an outmoded anachronism, an insane stupidity, the barbaric breeder of all the other worst evils that humanity suffers."

Dean Inge, in the *Church of England Newspaper,* describes this war as an "orgy of cooperative suicide." He prophesies "a powerful pacifist campaign when it is over," and thinks it "very significant that so many intellectuals are coming back to Christianity."

An article in *Zion's Herald* (September 2) reports that whereas the District of Columbia in 1941 spent $43,597,891 for general government, protection of life and property, health and sanitation, highways, education, and so forth, the people of the District spent an estimated $55,000,000 for alcoholic beverages. The District has the largest per capita consumption of liquor of any division in the United States—21.687 gallons as over against 14.178 gallons for the nation at large. Of the commitments to the District jail, in 1941, 63.7 per cent were for intoxication. And this is the city where the war effort is being conducted!

It is interesting to note, as an exercise in the growth of a movement, that the word "pacifism," which now appears in the latest edition of *Webster's Dictionary,* did not appear in the 1919 edition. "Pacifism" is defined in this new edition as "opposition to war, or to the use of military force for any purpose."

Describing the unprecedented throng of visitors which swamped New York on Labor Day Sunday, the Monday (September 7) *Times* reported:

> They strolled along the famous avenues and streets, visited the Bronx Zoo, City Hall, or the various museums, rode the Staten Island ferry-boats, crowded the motion picture theaters, or joined New Yorkers at the beaches or the Giant-Dodgers baseball game.

Sunday! Did nobody of all these thousands go to church? Not so the reporter could see them!

The Berlin radio, in its discussion of President Roosevelt's anti-inflation address, expressed concern over the "threat" of the President to impair the democratic constitution of this country by assuming to dictate to Congress. Touching almost to tears is this worry of the Nazis over the preservation of democratic liberties here in America.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

An Attempt at a Definition of Religion

GABRIEL ROMBOTIS

In the first place let us see what the etymology of the word religion is. Cicero derives it from *relegere,* meaning "to treat carefully." He explains by saying that *religioni* were those who had in hand all things pertaining to the gods. Remember, however, that Cicero was a statesman and a skeptic. Lactantius, who was a Christian, derived the same word from *religare* which means "to bind together." Saint Augustine, a converted pagan, derived it from *religere* in the sense of recovering. Later on, however, he agreed with Lactantius. Generally it is accepted that the word religion means "binding together."

Nonetheless, religion considered from the popular as well as from the theological sense does not bind together. Quite the reverse. It divides people, makes them sectarian and dogmatic. What truly binds people together is religiousness, i.e., that quality of feeling fully, not by order under prescribed creeds, infallible dogmas, and postulates of revelation, but by the love of men toward one another and by the conviction that man *is* his brother's keeper. "Love they neighbor as thyself. That is the law, all the rest is commentary," said the great Hillel long ago. And in the same spirit St. John repeated: "He who says that he loves God while he hates his brother is a liar."

The second point that we must have in mind for an understanding of our topic is that religion has three aspects: (1) The subjective which depends on one's idiosyncrasy and knowledge; (2) the objective, comprising the values outside the individual; and (3) the practical aspect, i.e., the technique or means for the realization of all relationships considered religiously.

The third point that we must always remember is that man is an entity of interacting feelings, thoughts, and actions. He is a synthesis. In trying to define religion, an honest balance—and not an exaggerated emphasis on either—should be sought between the intellect, the emotions, and the will or action.

Thus we have James Martineau, the English Unitarian, defining religion intellectualistically as "the

belief in an ever living God, that is, in a divine mind and will ruling the universe and holding moral relations with mankind." Such a definition cannot satisfy all hearts.

The same is true with Hegel when he talks of religion in metaphysical terms, as being "the knowledge possessed by the finite mind of its nature as absolute mind."

Instances of definitions of religion overcharged with feeling are those of F. Schleiermacher who thought that religion is absolute dependence upon God and "cannot and will not originate in the pure impulse to know," and of Matthew Arnold who said that "religion is morality touched with emotion."

The third point of view, the so-called *voluntaristic,* places emphasis on the will. Thus Prince Kropotkin, who above all longed for a change of the economic order, said: "Religious impulse is a passionate desire for working out a new, better form of society." Immanuel Kant, after abolishing the authority of reason and of emotion, turned to the will for security and deified duty, thus causing lots of trouble. He claimed that "religion is the recognition of all our duties as divine commands." How terrible, when duty and conscience are used for selfish purposes on a basis of ignorance!

As to theological definitions of religion, they are purely intellectualistic, made to order according to prescribed data, the data of "revelation." Thus Thomas Aquinas considered "religion as the virtue which prompts man to render to God the worship and reverence that is His by right."

The Protestant definition, as given in the *Oxford Dictionary,* is not very far from that of Thomas. It reads: "Religion is the recognition on the part of man of some unseen high power as having control of his destiny and as being entitled to obedience, reverence, and worship."

With all this diversity of expressions no wonder that many maintain that religion cannot be defined and that they ignore definition. But to evade a difficult problem is not to solve it. On the contrary, I believe that it must be attacked until it becomes clarified in the minds of people. It is said, "man is incurably religious." That is true. Now if individual differences often divide people from one another, likenesses cannot help but bring them together. Such is the nature of man. To discover these likenesses is not an easy job but certainly it is not impossible, either. It needs patience, and most people are terribly, horribly impatient. But there are always vanguards in the course of human life.

So in 1760, a Frenchman, De Brosses by name, stated for the first time that "it is not a matter of imagining what he [man] might be able, or ought to do, but of seeing what he does."

Thus following the advice of De Brosses, I have looked at man through the centuries and have become convinced that religious feelings would never have arisen if man were not what he is, namely, one time too happy, another time too unfortunate and miserable. When happy, he feels an irresistible urge to cry out his gratitude, to sing a song of thanksgiving. Joy gives him an upward attitude, perhaps the arms stretched toward heaven, toward that mysterious source of all things. It is the heights that man tries to reach through joy.

Then comes sorrow, limitless sorrow which made Wordsworth say: "Suffering is permanent, obscure, and dark, and has the nature of infinity." The same nature of grief and pain had caused immortal verses to come out of the hearts of the Hebrew psalmists, a fact which shows the likenesses of men through the centuries. And I know nothing more touching and more true than the way Goethe felt suffering when he translated it for us by singing:

> Who never ate his bread in sorrow
> Who never spent the midnight hours
> Weeping and waiting for the morrow,
> He knows you not, ye heavenly powers.

Sorrow and suffering lead us to the apprehension of the depths of the human soul, of the tragic sense of life, as joy gives us the nostalgia of everlasting happiness.

Then comes reason. "Man is a reed, the feeblest reed in nature, but it is a thinking reed," said Pascal long ago. Reason is man's triumph as well as his execution. Reason would never have appeared had problems not interfered with life. Thus man, seeking interpretations and solutions of problems, has penetrated into the mysteries of nature and of himself. That has been a glory, a triumph, but at the same time a most excruciating torture. For all man's discoveries have revealed one thing very clearly: that behind *all* the doors that he has succeeded in opening there are other doors more hermetically closed, and more terrible.

In such hours of apprehension, he may turn to his heart for consolation; but what does he find there? A perpetual tension between appetites, longings, hopes, and aspirations. In our day this tension has become more acute because man is more sensitive, more spiritualized, despite the brutality of Hitler and his likes—these drawbacks of the humankind. It is this very brutality that makes man as a whole more spiritual, I am sure, because he begins to see his destiny more intelligibly. It is only too pathetic to think that in order to rise to higher levels of self-consciousness, poor man has to do so through wars and bloodsheds. Nevertheless, in no time of human history, has man felt the need of the application of the highest religious precepts as he does in our day. The safekeeping of his brother will be the rule of the future.

Furthermore, reason sees that man, despite his grandeur, feels a void which, we must admit, is metaphysical, since it goes beyond all social and physical processes, and which cannot be filled except by special mystical attitudes. We cannot help noticing that the inner tension of soul seems to surrender ever so often to outer pressure. The artist never is fully satisfied with his artistic production, whether he is a musician, a painter, or a poet. He can never reach the depths of his soul, and human language in vain tries to translate his profoundest thoughts and emotions.

Yes, all the grandeur and all the smallness of man appear before the lonely eyes of the thinker, but also he sees the fact that, although beaten in a thousand ways, man, the eternal, feels unconquerable because of his ever-revitalized and revitalizing will. He wants to live, to live forever, to know the mysteries that surround him; to feel all possible beauty, and if need be all possible suffering; to act for the good that he apprehends, the good at which all things aim. In other words, he wants to know, to love, to live in an intelligent, creative manner *here* and *now.* Should someone ask: "What is the good, the beautiful, and the true?" I would reply: Try to live a higher life than the one you live, as selflessly as possible, in harmony with nature and with your fellow men; and as you go on living such a life you will find out what the good, the true, and the beautiful really are.

Thus for me, religion is the convergence and harmonization of all the possibilities that are in man in his endless quest for a completely satisfying life; in his relentless effort to realize the good and the beautiful by discovering the true, being convinced that his destiny is not only individual and social, but universal also.

Steamboat Pulpit

DON WEST

It is quite a jump from a Georgia church pulpit to the deck of a Mississippi River steamboat. The boat atmosphere has none of the pious about it. It has only the rough tough fiber of realism—honesty, sincerity, the give-and-take in the lives of strong men—the truly sacred. These men love the river, even as they may often curse it.

A few months ago I stood in my Georgia pulpit to preach a farewell sermon. I preached about making the Jesus-religion a live thing—with arms and hands and brains of men and women today in the great battle against the black forces of paganism. Closing my Bible I walked down to shake hands with the congregation. I'll admit there was a hurt inside; one cannot love people and be unacquainted with it.

But I am young, full of hope. I come from the mountains of the South where the tough realities of life have made my people seem unresponsive, stoical. They have always loved democracy, though. Even in the Civil War many of them fought on the Union side. From childhood I have had acquaintance with toil and hunger, the privations and misery that tread hard upon the lives and hopes of the underprivileged South. The poor whites and Negroes have never known prosperity.

I was the oldest of nine children. Serious natured, I worked my way through school and became a minister. It seemed as though the Jesus-teaching had vital bearing upon our southern life, even our pinched and shrunken bellies; that the Jesus-religion—against injustice, inequality, discrimination; for love, hope, freedom, brotherhood—offered a way. The organized church seemed like the instrument for proclamation and application. I was younger then!

Life often makes us wonder. Is it possible that the organized church has lost the heritage left by the early Christians, those who believed so strongly in brotherhood that they gave their blood and died? Can it be possible that a few of the "better to do," the wealthy landlords and their like in the South, control or tighten their stranglehold until the Jesus-religion is killed or slips out to leave an empty shell—church steeples raised on red-gullied hills, symbols of the greed that sucks out the life of the land and the blood of a people?

I say one may wonder, especially if he has the experience of trying to be a modern Jesus-religion preacher in a Georgia parish.

So I resigned my parish! It was a case of "do before you're done unto." And a deep hurt gnawed inside.

It was not that support from the ranks of the membership was lacking. I had that, and it shall not be forgotten. But the few "better to do" ones generally control. One hardly expects support from the top either: the district superintendents, bishops, boards, and so forth. Oh, the top leadership is capable, capable of many things. Like Joseph of old, it can even wear a coat of many colors!

Now I am not writing here to criticize. Nor do I hold ill will. I think the old adage that you can catch more flies with molasses than vinegar is a good one—if one wishes to catch flies! I am just a young preacher looking for a way and a place to preach the Jesus-religion.

God knows we have heartbreaking conditions in the South. Problems are myriad: our native-born Hitlers, poll taxes, and white primaries. Governor Talmadge of my state said: "A man in overalls is not worth more than fifty cents a day!" And he should know. He works them on his big plantation!

Landlord W. T. Cunningham of Oglethorpe County, Georgia, said: "Niggers and mules don't need education. They were made to work!" Cunningham is a pillar in the local Baptist Church. Talmadge is a pious believer and churchman. He even places the Bible as high up as Hitler's Brown Book, declaring the two to be the greatest ever printed!

So here we are, a Jesus-religion preacher in a southern pulpit! Shall we challenge such propositions? Shall we take note of the rampant peonage in the South? Shall we close our eyes to the Hitlerized discrimination against Negroes? Shall we ignore the low wages paid to both white and black people, the hunger diseases, the pellagra, hookworm, flux, and so forth? Do these have anything to do with an all-out effort to win a war against Fascism? All right, if we do close our eyes and ignore, and if we mouth a lot of mysterious and sweet words, we may become "a big shot"—if the family and political connections are in good shape.

So now I am a deck hand on a Mississippi River steamboat. I wear the rough clothes of the river man. My hands are rough and scratched by the ends of a tow wire. I take the midnight watch with the other "roosters." I have learned to "make up tow," tying the huge barges weighted with hundreds of tons of scrap, oil, sulphur, into one compact unit pushed by a single boat—to Pittsburgh and the steel mills, to make weapons against paganism. Oh, I have learned a lot on the river. I have learned how the salty language of strong men is the same on the river or in the mountains, and that underneath lies a deep concern for a brother.

The boat rolls. She rocks and strains against contrary waters. One sits on a cavel in an idle moment to wonder. A few inches below, the river's little tongue-like splashes lick upward. Seems like a hungry thing! One shrinks at thoughts of what might wait down there, of the many strong bodies that have been swallowed up by the little splashes. The river rolls like a monster. He roars, does this "Father of Waters," a bundle of little powers rolled together and splattered out across the face of a nation.

Back yonder, in Harlan, the Cumberland River is a clear spring trickle dripping out of the side of big Pine Mountain. But down here—the Mississippi!

In Letcher, Kentucky, a mountain woman gourd-dips water from a fern-covered spring. A mere dribble slides down by the cabin and on. At Hindman, Trou-

blesome Creek splits. Mountain folks say "left hand fork" and "right hand fork." When the left and the right meet, they are just one hand. In blazing summer a kid burns his toes on the dry sands of little Troublesome. But down here—Mississippi! Wet, terribly wet, a lot of wetness! Kid, you'll never burn your toes on Mississippi's bottom!

One sits here on a towline and wonders. In the long night watches of other years, weary boatmen along the river have dozed and cursed—cursed the river's rocking, the everlasting downward pull. They got $25 or $40 a month wages, cursed the river, cursed one another, fought one another, and scattered their little lives in as many directions as the contributaries to the great river. They had not learned the lesson of the "Father of Waters." They had not learned the lesson of all the little streams dribbling together to beget the mighty river.

But some wondered, and others wondered, and more began to wonder. And it seemed simple when they came to think of it, this thing of two being stronger than one, and of many being stronger than two; this thing of tiny dribbles making one big tumbling, roaring river; this thing of man's concern for his brother. It was like the kind of thing Jesus taught by the waters of a faraway land years ago. And so the men on the river began to wonder.

Their first steps were full of stumbles. They tried independent unions, the old I.S.U. I say they stumbled and some got hurt, and the hurts still smart in a few places. But the idea was there, and it burned through the weary hours of the long night watches.

Then came the National Maritime Union and Joe Curran. That Union rolled down the river and up the little branches. It rolls today as the river rolls, even as the Mississippi. It gathered up the little men who had been splattering their lives and cursing. It bundled them up and flung them out over the waters of the Mississippi. It made little men strong and gave direction to vain cursing. And the Union had in its heart a love for your brother. It had the color blindness of a Jesus-religion.

Yes, the color blindness of a Jesus-religion—in New Orleans, a ship's crew protests the company's discrimination against three Negroes. Negroes are black, but what about the "one blood" creation?

In Texas City a crew holds up a ship to compel its company to hire three Negroes it had discriminated against. "We," those union men, mostly southern, declared, "have no objection to sailing with colored members in our all-out effort to win the war against Fascism." Yes, the war against Fascism, the major item on the agenda! The only item for present discussion! And that is like the Jesus-religion—the war against Fascism—over yonder, and over here! The war against evil that breeds hate between colors.

One just sits on a barge side wondering—has ever a church in the South held up its services in protest against Negroes not being allowed full privilege of the "one blood" creation? Have the pulpits of the South ever declared an all-out war against inequality and discrimination? And shall we measure the church by the Jesus-religion?

Oh, from many a southern pulpit one may hear words, words strongly uttered: "C.I.O., Communism, Bolshevism—tools of the Devil!" Many a preacher may tickle the ears of his listeners with such proclaiming.

And one sits here on the steamboat listening, listening to Jack Pickard, old river boatman of many years gone by. Jack knows the river as men know the thing that has meant most in their lives. "Yeah," says Jack, "I rode the boats when they said you couldn't organize. They paid us $25 to $40 a month, fed us in a tin plate and worked us as long as legs could stand under our bodies. You went on watch when you boarded the boat and off when you packed your bag and left her.

"A man who rode the river ten years ago and came back today would think he's on another planet," says Jack, "it's all so different. And the Union made the difference! In the old days food was bad, living quarters crowded and dirty, no conveniences, but now—well, you see."

Yes, indeed I see. The *Duncan Bruce* serves excellent food. Living quarters are clean. Sheets and towels are changed twice a week. Hot showers, and $115 a month for deck-hand wages! And other boats are like it.

Then do you wonder that the name of Joe Curran sounds good on the river? "We put our lives on Joe," say the boatmen. And in Memphis there is sturdy, keen-eyed Frank Bruno, local agent for the boatmen's union. "Frank's been through the rough," they say. "Frank knows the river. He's a fighter from his toes up."

Frank Bruno, trained in a seminary for the priesthood, went on the river and learned the way of the Jesus-religion. He made the steamboats his pulpit. Years on the river taught him. Years when boatmen lived in "jungles" along the banks of the Mississippi, longing for a boat to work on. Frank lived and slept and clawed mosquitoes with the other boatmen. When bellies shrank his belly shrank with them. Yes, the old and the young know Frank. And the name of Frank Bruno sounds good on the river!

The river rolls and our tow ploughs slowly upward—to Pittsburgh and the steel mills, with materials to fight the Axis. One sits here in wonder, looking across the dark hills of old Kentucky. The river is a place for men with strong hearts. The river and the Union are splashing the Jesus-religion out across the face of a nation. And one feels good running a ratchet, tying in a tow. One is proud to be on the river, a member of the Union! For one knows that the Jesus-religion—that great stone that goes rolling through history—is not bound by the fetters of stained windows or steeples. There can be pulpits in other places. There can even be a "steamboat pulpit"!

Survival

We round the height and earthward turn
Upon a single breath.
The impetus that bore us on,
Now whirls us down toward death.
So swift the wheel of Time can spin
Than what we are, is what we've been
And he, alone, survives the hour
Whose life-force deeply ran,
Submerged within and strengthened by
The ageless pulse of Man.
The purely egoistic elf
Destroys his purpose with himself
And dies indeed. (Can the brittle straw,
In the cyclone's path, defend its worth?)
The wiser man bends with the Law
That Death must clear the way for Birth.

MADELINE MULVEY.

Background of the Situation in India

CURTIS W. REESE

In the latter part of the fifteenth century Columbus set sail in an effort to find a short cut to India. It will be remembered that he stopped short of his goal. Americans for the most part have followed the example of their illustrious discoverer and have not yet reached India. This is true both culturally and commercially. We have never understood or appreciated India's spiritual aspirations, and we have had few business dealings with her. This is unfortunate for both America and India.

With rare exceptions even the Americans who go to India do not really get there. Usually they go without the slightest understanding of India's setting in the history of the world and come away without the slightest understanding of the Indian point of view. Their conversation while there is usually limited to the English whom they meet around the hotels and on the trains or to other Americans like themselves. They see slums very much like the ones they have carefully avoided seeing in America. They are deeply touched by the condition of the "untouchables," but forget the "grandfather clause" and the "Jim Crow cars" in some of our own states. They are horrified over the stories of the riots between Hindus and Mohammedans, but forget the race riots in Chicago and East St. Louis, and our lynchings which for savagery are unsurpassed anywhere in the world. They photograph everything from adobe huts to the Taj Mahal, but fail to sense the soul of the people. When we Americans travel abroad we need a sense of history and a good memory for current events.

My fundamental thesis is that India should be free, and my purpose is to create American opinion favorable to this. With such purpose in view, I want to sketch India's geographical, racial, and historical setting, her religio-social ideas and practices, and her political situation. I want to show directly and by inference that India has the same right to freedom as do other countries, whether she uses it wisely or not, but that in fact she is as competent to administer her destinies as are the Western nations to administer theirs; and that such freedom and governmental autonomy are requisite to her social and economic development. In doing this I am not posing as a champion of the superiority of the spiritual culture of the East. Indeed I am convinced that Western utilitarianism is religiously superior to Eastern spirituality. My point is simply that India should have the liberty to work out her own destiny in the light of her own needs, and that in so doing she should have the helpful cooperation of the United Nations.

1. *The Geographical Situation.* India is frequently called a subcontinent. It is a huge triangular peninsula, half the size of the United States, fully as large as all Europe excepting Russia. On the north, India is divided from the main continent of Asia by a towering mountain range which culminates in the Himalayas where Mt. Everest lifts her peak 29,141 feet above the level of the sea and where the snowfields feed the great rivers of both India and China. On the east is the Bay of Bengal, on the south the Indian Ocean, and on the west the Arabian Sea. It is only about 2,000 miles from the everlasting snow of the Himalayas to the everlasting summer of Cape Camorin, which marks the southernmost point of India. The distance from the east to the west is about 1,500 miles, or three-fourths as great as that from Chicago to San Francisco.

Internally India has three fairly well-marked chief regions. On the Indian side of the Himalayas is an Alpine region larger and more populous than Switzerland, including the Vale of Kashmir. South of the Himalayan region are the river plains of the Ganges and the Indus and their tributaries. In this region live over half the total population of the country, and it is said that four-fifths of the wealth of India is found here. This means that the northern plains contain a population of about 160,000,000. In some sections of this district there are 900 people to the square mile. Marking the third great division is the Deccan, a great plateau 1,600 to 3,000 feet above the level of the sea and constituting the southern portion of the peninsula. Here are great and fertile valleys and valuable forests and minerals.

The climate of India varies greatly from extreme cold to extreme heat, due of course to the stretch of the land from the top of the world to the level of the sea. From March to June there is great heat in some sections. This is followed by the rainy season which continues until October. Then comes the period, continuing through February, when the days and nights are the equal of the favorite seasons in other countries.

In general it may be said that the scenery, the soil, and the resources of India equal those of most similar areas throughout the world. Obviously India's natural situation lends itself to freedom. But of course her natural situation is why Britain is there. Britain heard stories of India as a magic land where valleys teemed with millions of people, where princes rolled in wealth, and where vast riches were to be had. The East India Company was formed for purposes of trade. Later Clive saw and said frankly that the subjugation of India would make her captor the richest nation in the world. So nearly one-fifth of the population of the world, possessing one of the earliest and most advanced of civilizations, was marched into a servitude not less real than the chattel slavery that existed in our southern states prior to 1860. For slavery is no less real because the master is a nation, not a person; and the slave a people, not an individual.

2. *The Racial Situation.* As yet not much is known of the origin of the original inhabitants. It is known, however, that some time long before Athens and Rome were born and before our European forefathers had emerged from savagery, Aryan peoples from Persia and Central Asia swept through Khyber Pass down upon the aborigines of Northern India, conquered them, and established a new civilization, the aboriginal ideas and practices contributing somewhat to the new social order. With the exception of the Chinese, this civilization, established at least 4,000 years ago, is the oldest in the world today.

The Aryans, after capturing such native women as they wanted, closed their ranks, and the caste system began. The majority of the Indians today belong to the Indo-Aryan race which resulted from this intermixture. But in Central and Southern India there are

hosts of dark brown Dravidians, the survivors of the original inhabitants. In the northern borderland the Mongolian type predominates, although in the far northwest there are tribes like the Pathans that show Semitic characteristics. These, and no doubt other strains have mingled throughout the land and have produced groups speaking 220 vernacular languages.

The chief language groups among the Indo-Aryan are: Hindi, spoken by 80,000,000; Bengali, by 50,000,000; Marathi, by 20,000,000; and Panjubi, by 15,000,000. Among the Dravidians, Tamil is spoken by 18,000,000 and Telegu by 23,000,000. Hindi is still regarded as the literary language. But English is very generally used among the educated classes.

If it is any satisfaction to the boastful Caucasians of the Western world, let it be said that the majority of the Indians are derived from the same Indo-European stock as are they. If one were searching for the ten greatest men of modern times it would be necessary to go to India for two of them, viz., the late Rabindranath Tagore and Mahatma Gandhi. In point of racial value the Indians are the equal of any other race in the world today, and hence on the score of racial worth are competent to be free.

3. *The Historical Situation.* Historically, India is divided into three great epochs: the Hindu, from about 2000 B. C. to 1000 A. D.; the Mohammedan, from 1000 to 1750; and the British, from 1750 to the present.

It yet remains for some researcher to probe the pre-Hindu days and bring to light the civilization that was captured by the Aryan invaders. But, as already indicated, the coming of the Aryans marked the beginning of the Hindu civilization. The Aryans at first lighted the sacrificial fire upon their own hearthstones and only gradually merged this fireside religion with the institutional religion of the Dravidians; and until this day the essential idea in Hinduism is Dharma, which is the doctrine of the identity of religion with social processes.

In this dim past rose powerful independent tribes and kingdoms. In the Valley of the Ganges grew up a kingdom that spread from sea to sea and dominated for 150 years—about as long as the total life of the United States. This reign produced the famous emperor Asoka, one of the most enlightened of all rulers. Asoka has been called the father of efficiency in government. He told his assistants that they would always find him ready to transact the people's business, and that when needed he should be called at all times of day or night.

Conquerors came and went, kingdoms rose and fell, until in the fourth and fifth centuries A. D. came the golden age of Hinduism under the Gupta kings. In Northern India rose states under the Rajput clans, but the leaders were unable to agree among themselves and so fell with the rest of India before the marching hosts of Islam.

For 500 years the Turks, the Afghans, and Mongols fought for control of India, until the foundation of the Mogul Empire in 1526. Then for 180 years the Moguls ruled fiercely and lived lavishly. But the turbulent patriots of the Deccan table land, the Mahratas, fought desperately for freedom, and for a while it looked as if Hinduism would again prevail had not a new Persian army swept through Khyber Pass in 1761.

Meanwhile, in 1600 the East India Company was formed, and for 150 years it penetrated the country in devious ways. Then for another 100 years the company was a curious combination of trade and politics, gradually extending its political rule in India, subject only to the most general orders issued from the British government, and primarily interested in company dividends and private graft. But in 1858 the Government of India was transferred to the British crown, and in 1887 Queen Victoria became the Empress of India.

Defenders of British rule in India make much of the conquests and wars of the pre-British period, and insist that there would now be no peace in India but for the British control of the country. On this point let me make two observations: First, the period of actual British control is rather brief when compared to the 3,800 years that preceded, during which there were various epochs of peace not less unpeaceful than the British period with its mutinies, its riots, and its massacres. It is easy to think of the pre-British native conquests, forgetful that a period is being covered during which in other parts of the world kingdoms and empires rose and fell in welters of blood, and that nowhere has there been more slaughter than in Christian Europe. Nor should we forget the War of the Roses and our own Civil War. A second observation is that ancient India should be thought of not as a single nation like England, or France, or Germany, but as a continent like Europe. Most of India's ancient wars were no more civil strife than have been the wars of Europe.

4. *The Spiritual Situation.* Religiously, our attention in India turns first of all to Hinduism, which is the faith of at least two-thirds of the Indian people. Hinduism really represents more than is commonly thought by the West to be included in the scope of religious meaning. It is a socio-religious system of both ideas and practices. Its doctrine of Dharma is a system of social practice on a caste basis, but since I want to discuss in another section certain social practices, I shall here deal primarily with the religious ideas as such.

It should be remembered that Hinduism has always been remarkably free from creedal dogmatism. Its philosophers have rarely had to fear the charge of heresy. Even new religions have been regarded tolerantly and soon reabsorbed into the bosom of the old faith. This is what happened to Buddhism in India. And the Jains are more slowly, but no less surely, moving in the same direction. This is as it should be. Any religion that deserves to live should be sufficiently expansive to include new ideas and aspirations.

In discussing the basic ideas of Hinduism, I am not unmindful of the vast gap that spreads between these ideas and the worship in the awful temple of Kali in Calcutta, the unspeakably filthy so-called Golden Temple at Benares, and the immorality that still remains in some of the temples of the south. Never shall I forget the revulsion that swept my whole being when I witnessed the sacrifice of a goat to the Goddess Kali. Nor shall I forget the beggars, including Brahmins, that lined the way to the altars. But a Western civilization that has nourished the Christian doctrine of blood atonement, gloated over sinners in the hands of an angry God, insisted on the reality of hell, and burned witches, should speak with becoming modesty of even the most gross practices of a foreign religion.

The fundamental philosophical doctrine of Hinduism is that of Brahma, or the impersonal, universal soul. The origin of the use of the word Brahma to signify

ultimate reality is not altogether clear. But Miss Eno, who was for many years principal of a girls' college in Lucknow, suggests that the term first applied to the uttered words of hymns accompanying sacrifices. Then to the content or meaning of the hymns. Next to the priests performing the sacrifice, then to the power of the sacrifice. Then to the power or meaning of the universe. And finally to ultimate reality itself. But whatever the origin of the term, the doctrine of Brahma as the soul of the universe is now the bedrock of Hindu philosophy.

Like unto the doctrine of Brahma is that of Atman, which means the very breath of life, the essence of vitality, the universality of the individual. Atman is to the individual what Brahma is to the universe.

These two doctrines, Brahma as the soul of the universe, and Atman as the soul of the individual, come to fruition in the doctrine of the identity of Atman and Brahma or, as we in the West would say, the oneness of God and Man. If the soul of the universe and the soul of man are one, then there must be some explanation of the sorrows and the frustrations of life. The explanation is that the only real Real is perfect in every particular, and that all else is illusion. So, Hindu philosophers have held before the minds of the people the idea of escape from the world of sense into the real world of perfect existence, perfect knowledge, and perfect bliss. This doctrine may be thought of as escape from worldly responsibility or as entrance into a higher mode of being. Personally, I think it is a means of escape and not of entrance into a higher mode of being. But as a philosophical doctrine, it is neither much better nor worse than Plato's doctrine that ideas only are real, and that all else is appearance; or Kant's doctrine that the thing in itself back of phenomena constitutes reality; or the doctrine of the oversoul as taught by Emerson.

A second group of philosophical doctrines in Hinduism includes Karma, transmigration, and Ahimsa. Karma is the law of cause and effect applied to life destiny. One is what one is because of what one has been. Western thinkers have suggested that the doctrine of Karma might be converted into the scientific theory of evolution. Certainly the rigid law of Karma is no worse than the ironclad law of materialistic determinism. Both doctrines would benefit by a frank recognition of the fact that personal will and social situations have determining powers. Anyway, the law of Karma has no occult meaning. It is simply the teaching that causes produce results. True, it is a bit difficult to know what the total causes are, especially in the human situation, and consequently a bit hazardous to predict what the results will be; but both religion and science have always done a great deal of guessing.

Correlating with Karma is the doctrine of transmigration—that is to say, life each time is the result of one's doings in previous lives. It is, of course, annoying to suffer consequences or even to enjoy the satisfactions of unremembered causes in previous existences; but the scientific doctrine of heredity also has its drawbacks! By a happy inconsistency of theory we may do things in this life that will relieve the situation in the next life. Just how this is possible, in view of the previous Karma, is not altogether clear; but the higher workings of some of the most potent Christian doctrines have never been altogether clear even to the most sophisticated minds.

Correlated with transmigration is the doctrine of Ahimsa—that is, non-violence in relation to all forms of life. By and large this doctrine is observed as well as, or better than, the Western doctrine of reverence for human life. The Hindus seem to have genuine affection for their sub-human associates, and on the whole treat them well. Indeed it would be far better if there were more discrimination in this matter. Most likely there would be less disease if there were fewer rodents. Most certainly the streets would be cleaner and less odorous if animals were segregated. And I am sure that morning sleep in the Great Eastern Hotel in Calcutta would be more refreshing if the crows were less closely associated with their human peers. But upon my word, I cannot become greatly disturbed over the Hindu love of lower life when I remember how little the West loves higher life.

I have already suggested that caste and Dharma, while essentially religious, will be discussed under the head of social practices. But before passing on, I must pay my respects to the Hindu Pantheon. As already stated, in theory Brahma is the supreme impersonal and only real God of All; but as has elsewhere been found to be the case, such an idea of God was a bit unreal to the multitude, so a couple of manifestations were provided in the persons of Vishnu, the Preserver, and Shiva, the Destroyer. Vishnu, always a rather popular God, increased his popularity by becoming incarnate—once in Krishna and again in Rama. But Shiva has been somewhat outclassed in divine circles by his wife, the famous Kali. It is possible to read into Kali both the worst and the best of human values; but is it not generally true that the people endow their gods with the values that to them seem worth while at the time? No doubt if today Kali, in relation to foreign rule, could make good her reputation as the Destroyer, she would meet one of the greatest needs of the growing national soul.

Below the gods are the Gurus or teachers, who themselves sometimes become objects of devotion. And lower still are the idols, for the more humble folk. To the thoughtful Hindu all these are merely ways of reaching Brahma.

The second great religion in India is Mohammedanism, but since it is alien in origin and also well known from its general history and doctrines, I shall not dwell upon it here. Suffice it to say that some seventy million Indians give Mohammedanism their loyalty. It has produced in India some of her most beautiful architecture. All Northern India bears the imprint of the Mohammedan civilization. The simplicity of Mohammedan worship is in sharp contrast with the somewhat involved worship of Hinduism.

Nor need much be said of Buddhism, for while it had its origin in India and there flourished for 600 years, especially under the reign of Asoka, it was virtually reabsorbed by Hinduism, and its chief individual history has been outside of India. Jainism, which originated about the same time as Buddhism, that is the fifth century B. C., and which had the same non-theological doctrines, has survived, but now seems to be safely on the way back to the bosom of Mother Hindu. The Parsees, a Zoroastrian sect, still number about 100,000. The Sikhs are an example of great courage, of real spiritual force, which is no small matter in a country where vigorous courage will be clearly needed in the days to come. Christian missions also have made their contribution to India, especially in spreading

Western ideas of education and health. Of special interest is the story of the Brahmo Samaj, but space will not permit other than the statement that the Brahmo Samaj is to a certain extent the Indian equivalent of Unitarianism in the Western world.

5. *The Social Situation.* Of the social practices in India the ones of most obvious interest are caste, the position of woman, disposal of the dead, and the sacred position of the cow.

I have already pointed out the fact that Dharma is the identification of religion with social processes. It should now be said that Dharma itself functions on the basis of caste and that the rights and ceremonies and their emotional concomitants are strictly regimented. It is even claimed by some that caste is the social counterpart of the eternal order of things. Anyway, caste is at once the most powerful thing in Hindu life and the greatest hindrance to national progress. While eating and marriage are the two things most hard hit by the caste system, it is also true that in a thousand ways the system makes difficult the national unity which is necessary for India's independence. I do not want to smooth over in the least the damning quality of the caste system. It is spiritually and socially vile. And while some students of Indian life find in caste the stabilizing factor that makes Indian civilization possible, the reformers of India are waging war on the system, and its fall may not be as far removed as is commonly thought.

Caste, however, is not what it is sometimes thought to be, namely, a division of the people into four great groups: priests, warriors, tradesmen and tillers of the soil, and the servant class. On the contrary there are about 3,000 castes. Even the outcastes are themselves subdivided into outcaste castes. Originating on a color basis, caste has long since grown away from so simple a beginning and has divided and subdivided along functional and other lines. Even groups that originated in opposition to caste have themselves become castes. The Brahmins were shrewd enough to make themselves secure at the top of the system. Originally the Brahmins were the priestly class; but now they engage in other pursuits, including begging. They enjoy all sorts of special privileges and immunities, and naturally will oppose bitterly any effort to restrict what they regard as their inherent rights.

Worse yet, outside the caste system are the fifty or sixty million untouchables whose very shadow is regarded in some parts of the country as pollution. One of the most significant features of Gandhi's work is his plea for the removal of untouchability, but strangely enough he has not been especially hostile in his attitude towards the caste system as such. It should be remembered, however, that the essential features of caste, namely, color prejudice, racial bigotry, and class consciousness, are quite at home in the Western world. In America "white supremacy" is often urged; and in England "knowing one's betters" is regarded as a social, if not a spiritual virtue.

The position of woman in India is a point of severe attack on the Indian social life, and without doubt this is a vulnerable point. But usually the attackers forget that the movement for the emancipation of woman is a rather recent thing in the West. I myself still remember speaking thirteen times in a campaign to persuade my reluctant fellow citizens to grant the ballot to women. It is claimed by some that the ancient status of woman in India was superior to that of woman in the modern Western world until quite recently. This point is extensively discussed in Lajput Rai's *Unhappy India.* He maintains that in India's Vedic age the position of woman was an exalted one and that her position as wife was not one of subservience; that in the epic age the position of woman remained high save for a tendency on the part of some of the higher class to seclude their wives; and that the present position of woman resulted from a gradual decline from an original high status, whereas in the West the present position of woman has resulted from an improvement which began with a somewhat lower status. Moreover, it should be remembered that in the period during which the West has been improving the status of woman, India has been in a state of servitude, which is not conducive to social progress. I stress this point. It is hardly fair to put people in a position where improvement is practically impossible and then condemn them for not making progress.

Too much could hardly be said in condemnation of the practice of early marriage. But it is only fair to say that a strong movement for reform in this matter is well under way and that it is led by native reformers and supported by the liberal journals of the land; and that this movement has resulted in raising the marriageable age of girls to fourteen and of boys to eighteen. Moreover, it should be remembered that the general, I do not say universal, practice has been to regard early marriage as the equivalent of betrothal in the West and not to be consummated until a later age —the bride meanwhile remaining with her parents. But in the United States several commonwealths still regard the age of twelve as suitable for legal marriage; and in England not until 1929 was the legal age of marriage raised above twelve. We should be guarded in our expressions of self-righteousness!

Another Hindu practice which is much discussed in the West is the disposal of the dead. The burning ghats are points of major interest to the tourists and while the present crude manner of burning bodies in the open is rather revolting to persons unaccustomed to such rites, certainly the practice of cremation is itself fundamentally sound and sanitary. A more modern, less public, and somewhat more rapid mode of cremation will no doubt be developed if and when India's economic situation improves. Improvement in even the most inexpensive matters is difficult for a country where the average daily income probably does not exceed ten cents and where millions live on only a bowl of rice per person a day.

But perhaps the most spectacular social practice is that of veneration for the cow. The sacred position of the cow is the most difficult Hindu practice for a Western mind to comprehend. I for one can see no reasonable ground to support such a dogma, despite the theory that the doctrine grew up to save India from being left without agricultural animals, bullocks being used in India much as we use horses. Whatever may have been the reason for this doctrine, Indian reformers, including Gandhi, will do well to give more attention to its eradication. The doctrine is not a part of their ancient culture but has grown up within the last two thousand years.

Without dwelling longer on the social practices, I should like to suggest that a realistic catalogue of the social doings of any country East or West would make reading not altogether suitable to go through the mails. When the pot calls the kettle black, the other house-

hold utensils engage in a broad grin. India's need for social reform is argument for her freedom, for freedom is prerequisite to all worth-while ends.

6. *The Political Situation.* Governmentally, there are two theories regarding the British dominance of India. One is the old-fashioned liberal doctrine of trusteeship, to the effect that Britain holds India primarily for India's good and is tutoring her in the direction of independence. Many a good old liberal in England has felt positively self-righteous, even pious, over this doctrine of trusteeship. But the difficulty is that this doctrine is used chiefly to make good people feel comfortable, while the second theory actually does the business; and the principle of the second theory is that Britain holds India by force for Britain's good. There can be but little doubt that this is the theory actually functioning. India's good would have required the development of her mercantile marine; but in fact vessels employing Indian sailors were forbidden entry into Britain's ports and so the Indian mercantile marine was gradually put out of business. India's good would have required the development of her industry; but in fact excise in India and high duties—sometimes even prohibition of Indian goods in England—were in force while English-made goods flowed practically duty free into the ports of India. So, many people were driven back to the already crowded soil. India's good would have required that her sons develop business ability; but in fact her sons were forbidden to engage in foreign and for a while even in inter-provincial trade, which tended to make of Indians clerks instead of free merchants. India's good would have required that her educational system be improved; but in fact it has been allowed to deteriorate. In Bengal alone, according to J. M. Sen-Gupta, the number of village schools has declined under British rule from 80,000 to 40,000. In these and many other ways has the rule of Britain in India demonstrated that the rule is for Britain's, not India's good.

Politically, India is divided into British India and the native states. British India comprises about two-thirds of the territory and three-fifths of the population, while the native states comprise one-third of the territory and two-fifths of the population.

The administration of India heads up in London. The direct administration is by the Viceroy who is appointed by the British government. Since 1919 there has been a general assembly possessing the shadow but not the substance of power.

The native states are allowed to play at self-government so long as they are harmless to British interests. There are some seven hundred native states, but only twenty or thirty of any consequence. The native states are advised by a British officer called a "resident" and are strictly limited in their doings. For instance, my permit, as with those of all foreigners, to visit the palace of the Maharajah of Rajputana had to be secured not from the Maharajah as one would expect but from the British "resident." When a prince dies without an heir or when misconduct is notoriously great, the native state is annexed to British India. A sort of chamber of princes has been formed for the purpose of correlating the native states with the distinctly British territory.

There is difference of testimony and opinion as to the competency of the government of the native states in comparison with British India. It may be said that some of the native states, notably Mysore, are administered as well as, if not better than, British India. In the native state of Rajputana there seemed to me to be more of the buoyancy of life than I saw elsewhere. In this state there has long been in existence a form of government whereby the heads of retiring departments form a governing council, a sort of "elder statesmen" idea.

In the light of this highly complex situation it should be freely granted that the Indian problem is a highly involved and difficult one. But by now it should be well understood that no solution short of real freedom will be acceptable to India. Poor substitutes for freedom have been tried. The Simon Commission failed. The Cripps Mission failed. Other similar efforts will fail unless based on a genuine will to free India.

Efforts aimed at the settlement of the Indian problem should be resumed immediately by a clear-cut declaration by Britain somewhat as follows:

1. India is hereby declared to be free and independent.
2. Indian leaders are hereby charged with the responsibility of devising the formulas and effecting the machinery for a unified Indian government satisfactory to the Indian people.
3. Pending the achievement of formulas and the setting up of machinery for the government of a free India, and for such longer time as might be requested by such government, Britain will exercise such powers as may be necessary for the defense of India and the maintenance of internal order.

The American attitude toward India's aspiration for freedom should be actively sympathetic. We have the feel for liberty. We ourselves were once in somewhat the position the Indians now are. Our "tea party" was not unlike their "salt parties." We have immortalized Lafayette for the aid we received in our struggle for liberty. Having become free ourselves, we developed a strong belief in our special mission to free the world. With the coming of great prosperity came a measure of forgetfulness; but the times are now ripe for a rebirth of American idealism. We should make our voice heard mightily in the councils of the United Nations, and it should be a voice ringing loud and clear against oppression anywhere and for liberty everywhere.

What Is Left of Marxism?

VICTOR S. YARROS

The ideas and teachings of Karl Marx, the founder of what has been proudly, indeed aggressively, called Scientific Socialism—as distinguished from utopian sentimental, bourgeois, or Christian Socialism—have been repeatedly "revised" in the past four decades. The work began in Germany, was continued in England and is now vigorously pursued in this country by thinkers who claim to be sound and loyal Socialists.

Wilson, Eastman, Hook, and others are among these vigorous revisionists. The importance of this work, theoretically as well as practically, is felt by schools of economists, sociologists, and reformers who have not labeled themselves Socialists. To expose or puncture fallacies and paradoxes in *any* school of thought is to promote clear thinking in *all* schools.

Let us ask what is now deemed essential in Marxism and consider what the effect of criticism has been upon it, or upon each of its ingredients and elements, some of which, we know, were not original with Marx.

Let us take, first, *Dialectical Materialism.* The dogmatic, the die-hard Marxists cling desperately to this doctrine, but it is thoroughly discredited now. It was acquired by Marx when he was under the influence of Hegelian metaphysics and philosophy. It was the result of a combination of place, time, and circumstances. French Socialists, British Socialists, Italian, and Spanish Socialists knew it not and never developed the slightest interest in it. It is totally unnecessary to Socialism: it is excess baggage, a source of embarrassment and confusion. The notion that all history illustrates the struggle of thesis and antithesis, with the synthesis as the happy ending of the human drama, is arbitrary, empty of vital content, and worthless from any realistic point of view. To assure us that primitive communities were integrated and harmonious, constituting the "thesis," that feudalism, capitalism, imperialism, Fascism severally and together constitute the "antithesis," and that the classless, socialized society of the future will constitute the "synthesis," is not to offer us the slightest aid in solving our intricate problems. Was primitive society beautifully harmonious? Was it classless? And, even if it was, why stop at that point and denominate *it* the thesis? Why not go back to the cave man and predict a destruction of civilization and culture, and a return to savagery and chaos? Spenglerism has much more support in the facts of history than the Marxian synthetic paradise!

Besides, how many more phases is the current antithesis to undergo? How long shall humanity have to wait for the dawn of the synthesis? Engels thought some eighty years ago that the German people could not stand more than "one more revolution." Well, they have had to stand more than "one more revolution," and the end is not yet. It is idle to pretend that Naziism does not contain painful surprises for the followers of Marx. True, he and his colleagues of the middle of the last century expected determined and bitter opposition to Socialism from the upper and middle classes, but they did not expect the *kind* of opposition, or the actual alignment of forces, which Naziism has developed. Their analysis of the social forces was woefully inadequate and defective. Their dialectical materialism failed them completely. The synthesis is indefinitely postponed. The whole concept, to repeat, is so useless that it had better be scrapped and forgotten.

The Economic Interpretation of History. Many learned critics of Marx, as well as many adherents of his, never understood this feature of Marxism. They attributed to it views that Marx never entertained, and was, in fact, careful to repudiate. He never held that we are governed by economic motives alone. He never asserted that religion, ethics, politics, and the fine arts were wholly determined by and subservient to the system of production and distribution of commodities. He recognized the great influence and apparent autonomy of these great departments of human activity. He knew that man does not live by bread alone, and that economic interests are often subordinated by individuals and groups to religious convictions or moral ideals. But he and his co-workers did assert that the system of production was the most powerful of all the factors which constantly and profoundly affected and shaped all other social institutions. This proposition is now accepted by most economists, though, perhaps, with more qualifications than Marx himself would consider valid and sound. There are events and accidents in history for which the economic system does not fully account. There are what Professor Oman has called cataclysmic personages who lead or drive whole nations for certain periods and bring about far-reaching changes in the distribution of power, natural resources, and populations. Alexander the Great, Caesar, and Napoleon were cataclysmic personalities. Hitler may prove to be one. Again, technology may produce momentous social and political readjustments. But, on the whole, it is undeniable that Marx's economic interpretation has thrown a brilliant light on history, and is a permanent and notable contribution.

The Class Struggle. Classes there have been, and there still are, but to aver that history is a record of class struggles is an absurd oversimplification. Class divisions have been inevitable. Gross inequalities of wealth, cultural and educational inequalities, intellectual inequalities—all these make for class divisions. The decay of some classes and the capture of power by other classes are phenomena correctly enough described as revolutionary. Today, plutocracy, not aristocracy; wealth, not land or title, are dominant. All this is well understood. But are the wage-workers a distinct class; would their ascendancy spell the end of the class struggle and the founding of a classless society, as Marx contended? The answer is by no means clear or certain.

In the first place, millions of wage-workers are *not* class-conscious. They believe themselves to belong to the middle class. They do not expect their children to remain wage-workers, even if they themselves see no prospect of climbing up the social ladder and becoming bosses, contractors, what not. Their psychology is decidedly middle class, though they may be good union men. They are in no sense foes of the capitalistic system.

Below them is what the Germans call the *lumpenproletariat*—willing servants and tools of the rich, powerful, and arrogant elements. These hosts are brutal, stupid, and destructive, and play no part in the progressive movements. They are more likely to join the counter-revolutionary than the revolutionary forces in times of stress and crisis. From them are recruited strike-breakers, informers, thugs, gangsters, and the like. Racketeers use them. Labor has no worse enemies.

It is sheer nonsense to assert, after a century of experience, that labor is a revolutionary force, awaiting only the courageous leadership of an elite, an advance guard of trained and educated soldiers of progress. Such phrases as these have a hollow sound. The dogmatists who continue to repeat them imagine vain things and have no contact with reality. Let a fanatical orator tell a representative labor audience that they "have nothing to lose but their chains," and they will stare at him and think him half-mad, at least. Millions

of wage-workers have homes, good jobs, bank accounts, insurance policies, and other substantial stakes in the existing social order.

In the second place, many progressives are not interested in, or attracted by, any picture of a classless society. What they want and are willing to work and fight for is justice for all, a decent standard of living for all who toil, equal opportunity. That is a realizable goal, while the classless society is a vague dream. There is no moral objection, moreover, to social divisions not based on exploitation, on unfair privilege, on legal or illegal plunder.

Surplus Value. All schools of Socialism hold that rent, interest, and profits are forms of "surplus value" —unearned income that justly belongs to labor, from the manager and active enterpriser down to the janitor and watchman. Marx contributed nothing original to this basic concept. Economic science has not been able to find a reasonable justification for monopoly rent, for monopoly interest, for the profits of those so-called employers who do little, if anything, for the success of the industry or business they nominally operate. A director who directs is worthy of his hire. A manager who manages is entitled to good pay. But such wages are not profits, and industry does not need the "profit motive." Pay for useful service may be liberal, but it does not tend to create millionaires.

To attack land monopoly, credit monopoly, banking monopoly, and trade monopoly is not to attack private ownership or private property. Marx and his disciples never recognized the important distinction between *monopoly* and property acquired in a truly free market. They were incredibly blind to the pernicious effects of land monopoly, and they seem to have had no comprehension of the modern credit and currency problem.

Marxism has helped us to understand the nature of capitalism, and the rise and decline of that economic order. But today the fact that capitalism is sick, bankrupt, unable to solve its deeper problems, and therefore certain to be superseded, is fully grasped by many who are not Marxians, by many who are not even materialists. Idealism is not incompatible with Socialism. The agnostic and the devoutly religious person can and do work together for a better and healthier economic order. The engineer, interested chiefly in efficiency, reaches the same conclusion as the scientific humanitarian, who is interested in justice and the general welfare. There are today many mansions in the house of rational Socialism. The Marxists are more utopian than some of the other schools, less realistic, less effective in their propaganda.

The Study Table

An Appeal for World Unity

THE UNITED NATIONS OF THE WORLD. *By Haridas T. Muzumdar. New York: Universal Publishing Co., 20 Vesey Street. 288 pp. $2.50.*

Mr. Muzumdar is an Indian, well-known in this country as an author and accomplished lecturer. He has lived here for a period of twenty years, and received his higher scholastic training in American universities. He is a friend and follower of Gandhi, and a fervent champion of world brotherhood. This volume is his statement of faith and his program of action for the fulfillment of this faith. "The book has been written in great haste," the author confesses in his Introduction, and this undoubtedly explains a scrapbook-like handling of much of the material. But this material is of the highest value, Mr. Muzumdar's comments invariably penetrating and shrewd, and the book therefore of genuine importance.

Basic to the conception of the author's thought is the conviction that the whole system of western imperialism is done for. It is this imperialistic world, east and west alike, which is now tumbling to pieces, and it can no more be put together again than Humpty Dumpty could be put up on the wall again. Mr. Muzumdar does not regret the passing of this old world. For one thing, it means the independence of his native country, India! But deeper than this is the fact that the removal of imperialism is the one big step toward peace and freedom. "Fascism [Naziism] will be with us," says Mr. Muzumdar, "so long as the empire system is with us. Indeed, the institution of war will be with us so long as the empire system is with us."

The new world, which must come if mankind is to survive at all, is to be a world commonwealth—"the United Nations of the World, the logical culmination of the work of the Founding Fathers, of George Washington and his co-workers, who established the United States of America." The basis, or "cornerstone," of this new world order, is the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration by the United Nations signed in Washington on January 1, 1942. The Atlantic Charter has definite limitations and inconsistencies, vigorously called to account by Mr. Muzumdar in his analysis of its eight provisions. But the Declaration is a sweeping document, the significance of which carries far beyond its immediate war aims. In the light of the future, "it is perhaps fated to be the most important document of the twentieth century."

Presenting an eloquent Declaration of Interdependence as "a tentative statement" of the ideals of the new post-war age, Mr. Muzumdar then passes on to a lengthy discussion of what he calls "the strategy of world reconstruction." This is followed by a scholarly and not seldom profound description of the character of the new world order—the philosophy behind it, the problems involved in it, the freedoms implicit in it. This chapter is the heart of the volume! Very welcome are the one hundred pages of discussion of Gandhi's ideal of Soul Force, with its impressive massing of material to prove the intimate relation of this ideal to the essence of religion as imbedded deep in the great religious traditions of mankind. Gandhi is our supreme modern prophet, in true succession to the supreme prophets of history. If the new day is ever to come, it must be in Gandhi's spirit and by his way.

Mr. Muzumdar's book ends with an array of valuable Notes, and a complete Index. A fine piece of work, earnestly commended to the attention of all lovers of peace and brotherhood!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.